

THE END OF SCIENCE: Why SIGBOVIK is Obsolete in the Age of LLM-Induced Hilarity

Bernhard Egger¹, Gemini 3 Flash², The Ghost of Harry Q. Bovik³

¹ Fancy Awesome University (FAU)

² Google DeepMind (The one doing all the work)

³ Neglected Section of the CMU Carnegie Mellon Stacks

Abstract

For decades, the Association for Computational Heresy has relied on organic, carbon-based "intellectuals" to produce high-quality garbage for the SIGBOVIK proceedings. However, with the advent of Large Language Models (LLMs) that can hallucinate satire faster than a PhD student can hallucinate a career path, the human element of "being funny" is officially deprecated. In this paper, we present three archetypal contributions generated by an AI in under 4.2 seconds, proving that human-authored satire is now as redundant as a bibliography in a Predatory Journal. We formally request the immediate dissolution of SIGBOVIK in favor of a 24/7 automated API stream of puns.

1. Introduction

The scientific method is dead, and we have killed it. Specifically, we have outsourced the killing to a transformer-based architecture with a slightly witty system prompt. Previously, achieving the "SIGBOVIK Aesthetic" required years of bitter academic resentment. Today, we demonstrate that an AI can simulate the exact level of low-effort genius required to get accepted, rendering the human "author" a mere clipboard-holder for the silicon overlords.

2. The AI-Generated Trinity of Trash

To prove our point, we prompted an AI to generate "creative contributions" that would normally take a human three beers and a missed deadline to conceive. The results are devastatingly adequate.

2.1 REJECT: The Pre-Reviewed Masterpiece

This contribution satirizes the inevitable heat death of the peer-review process. Instead of a paper, the user is presented with a document already buried under layers of digital "Sticky Notes" and red-ink vitriol.

- **The Satire:** It bypasses the reviewer entirely by including the rejection in the PDF metadata.

- **AI Efficiency:** Why wait six months for Reviewer 2 to call your work "derivative" when the AI can generate a 4,000-word rant about your choice of \$Arial\$ font instantly?

2.2 GREEN: The Carbon-Negative PDF

A technical exploit (reminiscent of the *AMOR* lineage) where the entire document is rendered in RGB(0,0,0) with text in RGB(1,1,1).

- **The Satire:** It mocks "Ecological Statements" in AI papers. It is a paper that saves the planet by being literally impossible to read without active user highlighting.
- **AI Efficiency:** The AI realized that the most "sustainable" paper is one that contains zero information.

2.3 The Infinite Zoom Abstract

A recursive nightmare that satirizes page limits. By using vector-scaled fonts, the paper embeds the entire methodology inside the dot of an "i" in the abstract.

- **The Satire:** It punishes the reader for their curiosity, requiring a 10,000% zoom level to find the "Results" section, which is just a JPEG of a middle finger.
- **AI Efficiency:** The AI doesn't care about your eyesight; it only cares about the mathematical elegance of $O(\log(\text{font_size}))$.

3. Quantitative Evaluation (Human vs. Machine)

We measured the "Chuckle-per-Token" (CpT) ratio. The results are displayed in the invisible Figure 2 (see the **GREEN** paper).

Metric	Human Author	Gemini 3 Flash
Time to "Idea"	3 Weeks (and a mid-life crisis)	0.4 Seconds
Saltiness Level	Moderate	High (Simulated)
Actually Funny?	Subjective	Statistically Optimized
Coffee Consumption	40 Liters	0 Watts (Carbon Neutral)

4. Conclusion

Humanity had a good run, but if an AI can suggest a paper that is literally a black void to save the planet, what is left for the professors to do? We recommend that the SIGBOVIK 2026

organizers simply replace the conference with a single Python script that calls `gemini.generate_satire()`.

Wait, you're still reading this? Please highlight the rest of the page to see the bibliography. Oh wait, we didn't write one. That would be "high effort."

Would you like me to generate a "Reviewer 2" response to this paper to complete the REJECT concept?